

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/731,895	12/08/2000	Hyeon-Ho Son	8733.337.00 1204 EXAMINER	
30827 7:	590 05/10/2004			
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP			NGUYEN, DUNG T	
1900 K STREE	ET, NW N, DC 20006		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20000		2871	
			DATE MAILED: 05/10/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			A
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/731,895	SON, HYEON-HO	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dung Nguyen	2871	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence addi	ess
THE REPLY FILED 22 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this appli (1) a timely filed amendment wh	cation. A proper repich places the applic	ly to a ation in
PERIOD FOR RI	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires <u>03</u> months from the mailing date	•		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the shortene (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	han SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe ate on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. Insign and the corresponding amount of the distantory period for reply originally set in	of the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. Solution 136(a) and the appropriate extension or (the final Office action; or (the final Office action).	ee MPEP extension fee ension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered to	pecause:		
(a) They raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	terially reducing or s	implifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clain	ns.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje	ction(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed	amendment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: S		sidered but does NC	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	re newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims were		•	and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	:		
Claim(s) allowed: 5			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4,6-9,15-18,22-26,32-34 and 36</u>	5 -38 .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 10-14,19-			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) ap		the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme			
10. Other:			0

Dung Nguyen Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2871 Continuati n Sheet (PTOL-303) 09/731,895

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the device claimed do not define over the art of record. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive..

^